

## **Ocean Planning – Orientation**

**April 11, 2008, Ocean Planning Work Group Meeting (Notes)**

**Welcome and Introductions (Braxton Davis):** Introductions of Work Group members and attending staff (Braxton, Melissa Rada and Marvin Pontiff)

Ocean Planning Work Group Member introductions: Carolyn Boltin (SCDHEC-OCRM), Dwayne Porter (University of South Carolina), Paul Sandifer (NOAA Hollings Marine Lab), Paul Gayes (Coastal Carolina University), Adam Bode for Cindy Fowler (NOAA Coastal Services Center), Rick DeVoe (SC Sea Grant), and via phone: Bob Becker (Clemson Strom Thurmond Institute), John Dean (ret. USC) and Leslie Sautter (College of Charleston)

OCRM staff support: Braxton Davis, Melissa Rada and Virginia Shervette (not in attendance)

Braxton welcomed all to the SC Ocean Planning Work Group Orientation meeting. He pointed out that Melissa Rada is to be the primary contact for this initiative but that he and Melissa would co-manage the effort. He thanked all for their long travels and valuable time. Braxton explained that the initiative was established under South Carolina's coastal program 5-year 309 strategy for high priority issue areas, in response to 309 stakeholder meetings and discussions. Funding support is and will be provided for OCRM staff assistance and limited research/data acquisition to support planning. Braxton emphasized that this is and must be an equal partnership as we face ocean-related emerging issues. He briefly talked about the former steering committee, who met earlier in the year to help plan and scope out the effort. He noted that it is unknown what the Work Group will produce in terms of findings and recommendations, e.g. identifying data gaps and considering new and expanding ocean activities. It was explained to the group that OCRM will be able to generate the chapters of the final report as the group moves along, based on their continuing input. Research needs and existing information will be included, and any recommendations are up to the Group. Lastly, Braxton pointed out that there is no legislative mandate to do this (unlike some other coastal states with ocean planning efforts underway), but perhaps the result of this group's effort will be legislation down the road.

**Overview of Ocean Planning in U.S.** (Melissa Rada): See Melissa's PowerPoint presentation regarding ocean planning at federal and regional levels and in other coastal states. Also find the OCRM report, "State Ocean Management Plans and Policies Synthesis Report at <http://www.scdhec.net/environment/ocrm/science/index.htm>. During this presentation, a Work Group member pointed out that the regional efforts (SERPPAS and SAA) were described incorrectly as being two separate initiatives when in fact they are one and SERPPAS (federally driven) is simply the vehicle or mechanism for moving forward the South Atlantic Alliance effort, which is state driven.

**Overview of Ocean Steering Committee** (Melissa Rada): See Melissa's PowerPoint presentation and Steering Committee Meeting Notes (1/4/08 and 1/15/08)

## **Group Discussion**

The Group discussed the tentative work plan for the coming year. Braxton mentioned that Virginia Shervette (serving in a joint OCRM/University of South Carolina funded position) is already working to synthesize information on existing marine monitoring programs for the group, and this may be a topic area appropriate for a workshop in early fall. Next year she will be working on ocean aquaculture research, including public perceptions and environmental and economic considerations. A group member questioned the idea of looking only at aquaculture. What about the other fishery topic areas? It was agreed to that her research should focus more broadly, but that aquaculture was also an important component.

A group member brought up the importance of the group first needing to look at conflicting uses of the ocean and developing a cross-impact assessment, essentially developing a conflict matrix (recognizing that some uses may be complementary). It would also be a good idea to first develop an Introduction section that provides an overview that includes an analysis of the existing ocean governance frameworks at the state and federal levels and how these overlap, depending on the use/issue being addressed.

Another member seconded the point that the group needs to know up front what the current governance structure is before looking at these other areas mentioned (marine monitoring, aquaculture). It was suggested that one comprehensive management structure for the state is needed and should be complimentary with the federal agency structure to end up with a streamlined process. The Ocean Commission Report called for a lead federal agency for each ocean use – so can this be done at the state level? Group members continued to reiterate the need for understanding federal level structures because they are not there yet (streamlined), e.g. DOI vs. MMS. There are still overlapping and sometimes conflicting missions/directives among the relevant federal agencies. The group needs to know if MMS is now the lead for all proposed activities in the ocean. There is no moving forward until it is known who plays at the federal level. It was suggested to draw from other state plans for federal governance (NC, FL, NY & MA). Dr. Sandifer offered to pass along information he has regarding federal ocean governance.

The group agreed that the analysis of the existing governance framework, and the “ocean use matrix,” are the first two priorities for the report development. It was suggested and agreed to that once the report on governance is complete (projected for end of summer 2008), a workshop could be held in the fall on ocean use conflicts. After some discussions, there was no objection to allowing the marine monitoring work to be done simultaneously, building on Virginia’s ongoing research, as long as the governance framework analysis and the ocean use matrix is completed before moving forward with any of the resource-focused topic areas. Dr. Porter mentioned that an opportunity may exist to use a planned meeting of the Southeast Ocean Data Partnership to bring the OPWG together to consider ocean monitoring activities in late summer or early fall, 2008.

One group member recommended lumping aquaculture, fisheries and habitat into one category called “living marine resources.” It was also pointed out that energy must be bigger than just alternative energy. Oil and gas should be included. It was suggested that the group watch out for a public assessment report on offshore wind that will be available this summer. Another suggestion for topic areas was that sand resources expand to sand and mineral resources. Military and navigation need to be considered from a commerce angle, again considering overlapping impacts.

The group discussed education opportunities. It was pointed out that it would be great to get the information into lectures and out to college students. An example of doing this was that academics on the U.S. Ocean Commission took information to their students and invited students to come to public comment sessions. One response to this was that to get the information into curriculum, dedicated funding and coordination among the various state universities for an educational outreach program at the masters and undergraduate levels would be required. Funding for faculty to oversee the program in a structured way is essential. One group member mentioned that there are directed studies initiatives (C.H.E. & Lowcountry Graduate Center) where a multi-inquiry team is assembled and may be a good venue for this. Another point made was that the Sea Grant Consortium is set up for education and outreach and it is up to the universities to participate through Sea Grant. The first point made during this discussion was clarified – intended to focus on using the OPWG report and process to teach. In other words, use the materials being developed to enrich students’ education and just let faculty know about these new materials. Braxton informed the group that an outreach plan for the OPWG is a required element for our “ocean planning” funds and in our NOAA strategy, so this could/should be a part of the plan.

The last topic of conversation was about the recently developed contract with the University of South Carolina's Institute for Public Service and Policy Research to have eight survey questions about ocean resources added to the spring state survey (the state survey is administered in the spring and fall every year). The Ocean Steering Committee proposed and supported this for the purpose of gauging the public's perceptions about the ocean. A few of the group members discussed the usefulness of the state survey and that the University does a commendable job with the entire process. The members of the work group expressed interest in reviewing the draft survey questions that were developed and agreed to review them and provide comments to Melissa for her conference call with USC that following Monday. As an update, a few comments were received from the group and were incorporated into the final version of the survey questions. Since then they have administered the pretest of the survey, and results from the actual survey will be provided in June this year.

#### **Notes:**

People identified by the group as potential contacts on certain topic areas:

Steve Spitz, Charleston School of Law – review governance analysis document  
Bill Quinby, Aquaculture – Stakeholder/past research

#### **Next Steps:**

Melissa will prepare the governance analysis over the summer with guidance from the Work Group.

The Work Group will be invited to a June meeting that is related to ocean planning (Public Trust Doctrine and submerged lands leasing in SC). The date for the Public Trust meeting is tentatively set for June 13, 2008. **(This date was changed. The Workshop will be held June 25, 2008).**

Other meetings in the near future for the Work Group may include the cross impact assessment (Ocean Uses Matrix development) and monitoring workshops mentioned above in late summer/early fall.